

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA



**ASSOCIATION of
GOVERNMENTS**

Main Office

818 West Seventh Street
12th Floor
Los Angeles, California
90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800

f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

Officers: President: Toni Young, Port Hueneme •
First Vice President: Yvonne Burke, Los Angeles
County • Second Vice President: Gary Ovitt, San
Bernardino County • Immediate Past President:
Ron Roberts, Temecula

Imperial County: Victor Carrillo, Imperial County
• Jon Edney, El Centro

Los Angeles County: Yvonne Burke, Los Angeles
County • Zev Yaroslavsky, Los Angeles County •
Jim Aldinger, Manhattan Beach • Harry Baldwin,
San Gabriel • Paul Bowlen, Cerritos • Todd
Campbell, Burbank • Tony Cardenas, Los Angeles
• Stan Carroll, La Habra Heights • Margaret Clark,
Rosemead • Gene Daniels, Paramount • Mike
Dispenza, Palmdale • Judy Dunlap, Inglewood •
Rae Gabelich, Long Beach • David Gafin, Downey
• Eric Garcetti, Los Angeles • Wendy Greuel, Los
Angeles • Frank Gurulé, Cudahy • Janice Hahn,
Los Angeles • Isadore Hall, Compton • Keith W.
Hanks, Azusa • Tom LaBonge, Los Angeles •
Paula Lantz, Pomona • Paul Nowatka, Torrance •
Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica • Alex Padilla, Los
Angeles • Bernard Parks, Los Angeles • Jan Perry,
Los Angeles • Ed Reyes, Los Angeles • Bill
Rosendahl, Los Angeles • Greig Smith, Los
Angeles • Tom Sykes, Walnut • Paul Talbot,
Alhambra • Sidney Tyler, Pasadena • Tonia Reyes
Uranga, Long Beach • Antonio Villaraigosa, Los
Angeles • Dennis Washburn, Calabasas • Jack
Weiss, Los Angeles • Dennis Zine, Los Angeles

Orange County: Chris Norby, Orange County •
Christine Barnes, La Palma • John Beauman,
Brea • Lou Bone, Tustin • Art Brown, Buena Park
• Richard Chavez, Anaheim • Debbie Cook,
Huntington Beach • Cathryn DeYoung, Laguna
Niguel • Richard Dixon, Lake Forest • Marilyn
Poe, Los Alamitos • Tod Ridgeway, Newport
Beach

Riverside County: Jeff Stone, Riverside County •
Thomas Buckley, Lake Elsinore • Bonnie
Flickinger, Moreno Valley • Ron Loveridge,
Riverside • Greg Pettis, Cathedral City • Ron
Roberts, Temecula

San Bernardino County: Gary Ovitt, San
Bernardino County • Lawrence Dale, Barstow •
Paul Eaton, Montclair • Lee Ann Garcia, Grand
Terrace • Tim Jasper, Town of Apple Valley • Larry
McCallon, Highland • Deborah Robertson, Rialto
• Alan Wapner, Ontario

Ventura County: Judy Mikels, Ventura County •
Glen Becerra, Simi Valley • Carl Morehouse, San
Buenaventura • Toni Young, Port Hueneme

Orange County Transportation Authority: Lou
Correa, County of Orange

Riverside County Transportation Commission:
Robin Lowe, Hemet

Ventura County Transportation Commission:
Keith Millhouse, Moorpark

MEETING OF THE

PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Thursday, October 20, 2005
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

**SCAG Offices
818 W. 7th Street, 12th Floor
San Bernardino Conference Room
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 236-1800**

Video Conference Location

SCAG Inland Empire Office
3600 Lime Street, Suite 216
Riverside, CA 92501
(951) 784-1513

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Philip Law at (213) 236-1841 or law@scag.ca.gov.

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. If you require such assistance, please contact SCAG at (213) 236-1868 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to enable SCAG to make reasonable arrangements. To request documents related to this document in an alternative format, please contact (213) 236-1868.



PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

ITEM	PAGE #
1.0 <u>Call to Order and Introductions</u>	Chair Doug Kim, LACMTA
2.0 <u>Public Comment Period</u>	Members of the public desiring to speak on an agenda item or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of this committee, must fill out a speaker's card prior to speaking and submit it to staff before the meeting is called to order. Comments will be limited to three minutes. The Chair may limit the total time for comments to twenty (20) minutes.
3.0 <u>Consent Calendar</u>	
3.1 <u>Approval of Meeting Minutes from September 15, 2005</u> <u>Attachment</u>	1
4.0 <u>Discussion Items</u>	
4.1 <u>Standing Items</u>	
4.2.1 <u>TDM / Non-Motorized</u> <u>LACMTA Bicycle Plan</u>	Lynn Goldsmith, LACMTA
4.2.2 <u>Highways and Arterials</u> <u>LACMTA Arterial Master Plan</u>	Kathleen McCune, LACMTA
4.2.3 <u>Growth Forecast</u> <u>No report</u>	
4.2 <u>STIP Fund Estimate and Impact to RTP</u> <u>Financial Plan</u>	Annie Nam, SCAG
4.3 <u>RTP Project List Update</u> <u>Attachment</u>	Philip Law, SCAG
5.0 <u>Staff Report</u>	
6.0 <u>Comment Period</u>	Any Committee member, member of the public, or staff desiring to comment on items not covered on the agenda may do so at this time. Comments should be limited to three minutes.



PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

ITEM

PAGE

7.0 **Next Meeting Date & Adjournment**

The next meeting date is Thursday, November 17, 2005, 10 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.



PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES for September 15, 2005

The following minutes are a summary of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting. Audio cassette tapes of the actual meeting are available for listening at SCAG's office.

1.0 **Call to Order and Introductions**

The Chair Mr. Douglas Kim, LACMTA, called the meeting to order. Introductions were made.

2.0 **Public Comment Period**

There were no comments.

3.0 **Consent Calendar**

3.1 **Approval of Meeting Minutes from June 16, 2005**

The meeting minutes were approved. Comments were made concerning the SHOPP presentation from the June 16 meeting. It was noted that the SHOPP allocation proposed for 2005 and 2006 is roughly half of what is actually needed, and this was a miscommunication as to the magnitude of need for the state highway system. It was also noted that there are discussions occurring in the League of Cities and CSAC on the disposition of some of the Surface Transportation Program funding, with the suggestion that this funding should be diverted directly to local governments instead of through the STIP process. However, the current process should be maintained, as any additional federal funding could be used to fill the gap between what is actually being spent and what is needed to preserve the state highway system. It was also noted that there is no accurate measure of the statewide need.

4.0 **Discussion Items**

4.1 **RTP Update Issues**

Mr. Hasan Ikhata, SCAG, provided an update on various RTP-related issues. Regarding SAFETEA-LU, SCAG is currently communicating with the federal agencies regarding the provision which extends the RTP cycle from 3 years to 4 years. At issue is the conformity clock, which runs out in June 2007 and would ostensibly rule out the possibility of delaying the 2007 RTP to 2008. Currently SCAG is planning to go ahead with a 2007 RTP.

Regarding the growth forecast, SCAG will not release any numbers until a panel of experts representing the counties and subregions has had the chance to review the information. Mr. Ikhata added that the RHNA process will also complicate matters.

Regarding the financial forecast, currently the state is debating between a STIP with no new funding and a STIP that is short 3 to 4 billion dollars. Additionally, the SHOPP needs more money than has been allocated. The challenges include developing a realistic baseline and plan that the federal agencies will accept. In the last RTP, some



MINUTES for September 15, 2005

counties had negative revenue forecasts due to the cost of maintaining and operating the existing system. Mr. Ikhata stated that any commission that has capital to do additional projects should present a strong case as to where that money is coming from.

Regarding the growth visioning, Mr. Ikhata stated that we have modeling and analytical issues in terms of reflecting the impact of transportation alternatives and land use. We only have approximate tools to link transportation and land use.

Achieving conformity will be a challenge, particularly with regards to goods movement, and especially for San Bernardino and the Coachella Valley. Mr. Ikhata discussed the recent executive roundtable that brought together public sector representatives and the private sector to discuss goods movement issues. A SCAG study conducted by Professor Leachman from Berkeley examined the port and modal elasticity with respect to access fees. Even a small fee could divert port traffic, but if you provide additional infrastructure you would get an increase in transloading and a slight decrease in overall port activity. We are working on an MOU with the county commissions and state and federal agencies to develop an institution to address these regional goods movement issues.

There was a question regarding the new RTP 4-year cycle and its impact on the current RHNA schedule. Mr. Ikhata stated that there is a lot of confusion regarding this issue, and not simply over the schedule. RHNA should be coordinated with the RTP, but there is disagreement at the state, between HCD and BT&H, over how to proceed. RHNA is an unfunded mandate and they are proposing to charge the members for providing information on housing needs, and it doesn't make sense for a nonprofit organization to do that.

4.2 Standing Items

4.2.1 TDM / Non-motorized

There was no report.

4.2.2 Highways and Arterials

Update on Goods Movement Executive Roundtable

Ms. Nancy Pfeffer, SCAG, gave a brief overview of goods movement in Southern California and an update on the goods movement roundtable. Southern California ranks 5th in the world in terms of total inbound container volume. Over 60% of US-Asian trade comes through the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and about 77% of the imports through here end up somewhere else in the country. The port forecast of growth calls for a tripling to 44.5 million TEU in 2030. Our ports have a number of advantages in terms of facilities and infrastructure that provide flexibility for shippers, as well as half a million jobs in the logistics industry.



MINUTES for September 15, 2005

The elasticity study focused not only on transportation costs but also on the inventory costs. In terms of transloading, the 44-foot marine container is the standard but we are transloading to 53-foot domestic containers because they provide 60% more capacity. Transloading and consolidation allows shippers to cut one month or more out of the time between placing an order in Asia and actually having the order arrive at the port. This reduces the safety stock and pipeline stock that can increase costs by 18% to 20%.

Ms. Pfeffer stated that the elasticity study shows that it would make sense for the private sector to invest in goods movement infrastructure. The consultant on the study developed a model of shippers' economic decision-making by getting information on how they choose where to ship, whether to transload or ship direct, what the value of freight is, etc. One of the key findings is that shippers are more sensitive to congestion than they are to the cost of the transportation. We will lose trade if we don't invest in congestion relief. Assuming we do invest in infrastructure for goods movement, a container fee of \$200 per 40-foot equivalent would represent the maximum fee that could be charged before we would see a significant diversion in port activity.

Ms. Pfeffer stated that SCAG conducted an analysis of the potential for toll-financed truckways and the value of time saved. With an assumption of an average \$73 value of time for truck drivers, the return on investment can be up to 5 to 6 times the cost. A similar analysis was conducted for freight rail. Through a combination of tolls and container fees, a total of \$26 billion in goods movement improvements can be funded, along with \$10 billion for environmental mitigation, without exceeding the \$200 container fee limit established by the elasticity study.

In response to a question, Ms. Pfeffer stated that there is a public contribution towards the infrastructure. Ms. Annie Nam, SCAG, stated that the public subsidy component would be based upon the kinds of financing instruments that you actually utilize. If you compare a tax credit bond against a taxable bond, depending on how you structure it, you can get as much as a 60% subsidy. Therefore it is a substantial savings for capital investment.

Mr. Ty Schuiling, SANBAG, stated that freight movement will be more likely to divert as a result of increasing congestion here than as a result of the imposition of the additional fees. The worst case scenario is that traffic worsens, air quality is further impacted by the traffic, and we don't have any economic benefits driven by growth in transloading. Low value trade is more sensitive to fee collection than high value trade, which means that if everything is diverted to low value trade, it will move through our region and consume our system capacity but won't provide much in local benefits. High value trade is the material that has higher inventory costs, therefore it gets greater benefit from transloading and creates jobs, and that is what is actually increased by fee collection as long as the fees are dedicated to relieving congestion and increasing the reliability of moving the freight through the region.



MINUTES for September 15, 2005

Two technical issues were noted. First, we need more clarification on what kinds of infrastructure investments will lead to the benefits identified in the elasticity study. Second, we don't have a definitive strategy to spend \$10 billion on environmental mitigation.

There was a question regarding how the transportation solutions would be handled in the RTP. In response, Ms. Pfeffer stated that the Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan will work on the priorities over the next 18 months.

4.2.3 Growth Forecast

RHNA

Mr. Joe Carreras, SCAG, stated that the next RHNA cycle calls for the local housing elements in our region to be due by July 2008. The RHNA plan will be due July 2007. We are going to be a testing ground for the state for two major laws that were passed by the legislature in December 2004. The details were included in the agenda attachment. The other major testing ground is the matter of funding. In the past, we were reimbursed by the local state mandate commission for implementing RHNA, but that is no longer available to us. The legislature has given us the authority to institute a fee, but we are strongly against doing that.

A third new element in the housing planning process is the coordination with regional transportation planning. There are specific references in the law relating the RHNA process and the RTP process, particularly in developing the population forecast. We added 1.5 million people in the first five years of the forecast. We are on track to add three cities the size of Chicago, rather than two cities that we had forecasted in the 2004 RTP. We have collectively as a region made our RHNA planning target from last cycle, however there is a huge gap between housing prices and income. Most subregions did well in meeting their targets, but about half of the jurisdictions did not.

Housing prices have been driven to astronomical levels in our region, even in the High Desert which has the most affordable housing prices in the state. Affordability levels have dropped significantly below the US national figure. The national median price has gone up from \$175,000 four years ago to over \$210,000 today. Now we talk about affordable housing in terms of the \$300,000 home. We see the huge income gap between the \$50,000 median household income in the region and what it would take to afford this affordable home, and that's why we have so many innovative mortgages that help people keep pace with the prices.

Next, Mr. Carreras discussed the changes of the new RHNA laws, which aim to result in better coordination, more specific definition of roles and responsibilities, a better consultation process, and more transparency, all leading to more housing. Unfortunately, the process has many more required



MINUTES for September 15, 2005

steps than the legislature could imagine. They are asking to create so much data that it is going to be hard to process and put into effect, with no time for those data to be used. There is a very complex residential land suitability analysis, and the new fees-based approach for funding RHNA is very unpopular. There is concern that the process will be hard to follow. There is no improvement on the trade and transfer and cooperative planning opportunity that we promoted in the legislature. There are no new features of the law in terms of counting rehabilitation and preservation of housing as a way to meet housing need.

The state government has a plan to try to link the housing need allocation to employment growth and demographic growth city by city and county by county. It is a major element of the California Blueprint funding program for metropolitan organizations. John Landis from UC Berkeley developed an infill parcel locator to try to identify infill capacity for the state, and the state is trying to relate infill capacity as a way to meet much of the future housing need. It revealed the development pressure in environmentally sensitive areas and productive agricultural areas. Mr. Carreras stated that we have our own tool called LA LOTS, which takes an interactive web-based approach to help define development opportunity and bring together data that can help assess the suitability and not just the capacity of developing on any particular site. The 2% Strategy is an element in our Blueprint application that is promoting a more policy-based approach to housing planning for growth.

Ms. Tracy Sato, City of Anaheim, stated that one of the issues from the last RTP was whether we would have a forecast for housing that is needs based or supply based. Mr. Carreras stated that is an ongoing problem, and the statute looked at it as a need-based forecast that is proportionally consistent with the population forecast in the new RTP. The 2% Strategy will examine different ways that communities could potentially address their housing needs. We have scenario planning objectives that try to engage the region in a positive debate on a longer view.

4.3 Maglev Status Reort

Mr. Zahi Faranesh, SCAG, provided a verbal report on this item. He said that there are two contracts in progress. The Alternative Analysis study, which was requested by LADOT, compares the State High Speed Rail (steel on wheel) technology, and the Magnetic Levitation (Maglev) technology along the Initial Operating Segment (IOS). The IOS corridor extends from Ontario Airport to West Los Angeles. Cambridge Systematics is the consultant performing the study. There is a Memorandum of Understanding among the City of Los Angeles, City of Ontario, San Bernardino Associated Governments, and SCAG for this study. Funding of the study is from a grant from the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). The City of LA, City of Ontario, and SANBAG provided matching funds for the grant.

The nine-month study will be managed by four project managers: Allyn Rifkin (LADOT), Ty Schuiling (SANBAG), John Sullivan (Ontario), and Zahi Faranesh



MINUTES for September 15, 2005

(SCAG). Also, a working group of the P&P TAC will review and comment on the consultant's work products. The working group shall be part of the P&P TAC and shall consist of one representative from each stakeholder along the IOS. The working group shall report any issues of concern arising out of the consultant work to the P&P TAC and to the Project Managers. The P&P TAC shall make recommendations regarding resolution of issues of concern identified by the working group to the Maglev Task Force.

The second contract is Phase 2 of the Lockheed Martin contract which will prepare preliminary engineering for the IOS corridor. The study will be completed by June 2006.

Mr. Faranesh explained that the Maglev deployment will be a public/private venture. The public will donate the land such as freeway or railroad rights of way, and the private sector will design, build, operate, and maintain (DBOM) the system. Mr. Faranesh answered a question related to the West Los Angeles Multi Modal Transfer Facility project by stating that funding for this project is from a State Planning and Research (SPR) grant from Caltrans and FHWA. The consultant is Aztec Engineering, and the study is for one year. The consultant will coordinate with other Maglev contracts.

4.4 SAFETEA-LU Highlights

Ms. Sarah Adams, SCAG, presented programmatic highlights from the recently passed SAFETEA-LU. The new law is in effect from August 10, 2005 through September 30, 2009, and provides over \$286 billion. Some of the bill's features include an increase of MPO funding from 1% to 1.25% of the core programs, an increase of the minimum guarantee to states to 92% by 2008, and the extension and synchronization of the RTP and RTIP cycles to every 4 years (versus the current 3-year cycle). Some of the major earmarks for the SCAG region include \$400 million for the Eastside Light Rail Line, \$178 million for Alameda Corridor East, and \$75 million for the Inland Empire Goods Movement Gateway Project.

4.5 SAFETEA-LU Earmarks in the SCAG Region

Mr. Naresh Amatya, SCAG, reported that staff reviewed the earmark projects and identified the status of each of the projects, whether they are in the 2004 RTIP or in the 2004 RTP as a Baseline, Tier 2 or Plan project. He stated that most of the projects are not in any of our plans and programs, nor are they even in our unconstrained list of projects. He further emphasized that we would need to move these projects quickly through the RTIP process in order to ensure obligating these projects in a timely manner.

4.6 RTP Timeline

Mr. Naresh Amatya, SCAG, reported that staff is no longer pursuing the idea of updating the RTP on an accelerated timeline. Most of the original issues that prompted us to consider an accelerated schedule for the RTP update, related primarily



PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES for September 15, 2005

to funding uncertainties such as the State Budget, Proposition 42, and TEA reauthorization, have been resolved. Currently, staff is reviewing whether we should update the RTP based on the TEA-21 requirements or the new SAFETEA-LU, which allows up to 4 years to update the RTP in non-attainment and maintenance areas such as ours. Staff have been reviewing the SAFETEA-LU provisions and interim guidelines issued by the federal agencies. The interim guideline issued by the federal agencies appear to indicate that the MPOs have the option to update their current plans on a 4-year cycle per SAFETEA-LU, provided they comply with all the other provisions of the new bill, including explicit inclusion of environmental mitigation measures into the plan and added emphasis on transportation system security, non-motorized transportation, and system preservation.

Ms. Grace Balmir, FHWA/FTA, commented that it is premature to conclude that the 4-year cycle can be applied to the current update cycle. She noted that SCAG would still need to deal with the fact that the conformity on the current RTP lapses in June of 2007. She further indicated that SCAG should articulate the option that SCAG wishes to pursue and forward it to FHWA/FTA so they can review and evaluate it prior to providing a firm direction. Ms. Eyvonne Seles, AQMD, expressed that the RTP update schedule must be coordinated closely with AQMD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) development schedule. Mr. Ty Schuiling, SANBAG, expressed concern that SIP development was not being coordinated adequately with the RTP development. Particularly, he expressed concerns over the challenges the region is likely to face in meeting emission tests for PM2.5, which is more stringent than PM10.

5.0 Staff Report

There was no staff report.

6.0 Comment Period

There were no comments.

7.0 Next Meeting Date & Adjournment

The next meeting date was announced as October 20, 2005, and the meeting was adjourned.



PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES for September 15, 2005

Attendance

Name	Agency
Grace Balmir	FTA/FHWA
Shefa Bhuiyan	Caltrans-District 8
Joanna Capelle	SCRRA
Eric Carlson	LACMTA
Deborah Diep	CDR, CSU Fullerton
Guan Falan	LACMTA
Dana Gabbard	So. Calif. Transit Advocates
Falan Guan	LACMTA
Gary Green	Caltrans-District 8
Jack Humphrey	Gateway Cities COG
Douglas Kim	LACMTA
Brian Lin	LACMTA
Richard Marcus	OCTA
Paula McHargue	LAWA
David Mootchnik	So. Cal. Commuters Forum
Ian Pari	City of Santa Clarita
Tracy Sato	City of Anaheim
Eileen Schoetzow	LAWA
Ty Schuiling	SANBAG
Eyvonne Sells	SCAQMD
Arnold Sherwood	University of California ITS
Gail Shiomoto-Loehr	Orange County COG
John Stesney	LACMTA
Jim Stewart	SCCED
Jack Tsao	City of Los Angeles
Tony Van Haagen	Caltrans-District 7

Via audio/video conference

Paul Fagan	Caltrans-District 8
Jason Finch	City of Palmdale
Ken Lobeck	RCTC
Kevin Viera	WRCOG
Jeff Weir	ARB

SCAG Staff

Sarah Adams
Naresh Amatya
Zahi Faranesh
Bob Huddy
Hasan Ikhata
Rich Macias
Alan Thompson
Frank Wen



MEMO

DATE: October 20, 2005
TO: PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: Philip Law, Associate Regional Planner, 213-236-1841, law@scag.ca.gov
RE: RTP Project List Update

As part of the development of the 2007 RTP, SCAG will be updating the input and assumptions that form the basis for the alternatives analysis. This task includes updating the RTP project inventory. SCAG has already initiated the process for developing the 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), which forms the basis for the No Project scenario of the RTP and also identifies the region's committed short-term transportation projects (called Tier 2) that will be given funding priority over additional plan projects. Above and beyond the RTIP are additional plan projects called the constrained list, and above that is the wish list of unconstrained projects. The focus of the project list update will be on identifying changes to the constrained and unconstrained projects in the 2004 RTP, and identifying new projects for inclusion in the RTP.

The schedule for the project inventory update for the 2007 RTP is constrained by the schedule for the 2006 RTIP. The county transportation commissions and IVAG will be submitting to SCAG their input to the RTIP by December 2005. Modeling and analysis for the RTIP will begin in March 2006, and the release of the draft RTIP is scheduled for June 2006, followed by final adoption in August 2006.

For this reason, SCAG is asking that proposed long-range RTP projects above and beyond the RTIP be submitted by the county transportation commissions and IVAG no later than March 2006. At that point in time, the RTIP and No Project performance analysis will have begun. The results of the analysis, along with the RTP project submittals, will serve as inputs to the RTP scenario development process.

The attached draft memorandum outlines this request and is provided for the TAC's review.



DRAFT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Imperial Valley Association of Governments
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Orange County Transportation Authority
Riverside County Transportation Commission
San Bernardino Associated Governments
Ventura County Transportation Commission

CC: Subregional Agencies
Caltrans Districts 7, 8, 11, 12
Transit Operators
Ports and Airports

FROM: Hasan Ikhata, Director, Planning and Policy

DATE: October 20, 2005

SUBJECT: 2007 Regional Transportation Plan – Project List Update

SCAG is in the process of updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which is currently scheduled for adoption by the Regional Council in April 2007. This effort involves reviewing and adjusting the planning assumptions, including the growth forecast, financial plan, and transportation projects and programs, to reflect the latest available information and regional priorities.

SCAG is asking that the county transportation commissions and IVAG take the lead in coordinating their respective countywide submittals for consideration in the 2007 RTP. The focus of this exercise is to update information on all of the regionally significant projects that were included in the 2004 RTP as constrained or unconstrained projects, and to submit additional projects, if any, for consideration in the 2007 RTP.

This task consists of the following steps:

1. Review the attached list of constrained and unconstrained projects from the 2004 RTP.
2. Identify changes to project scope, cost, and schedule, including project completion or project deletion. Indicate the reason for proposed changes or deletions, such as schedule delays due to funding issues and/or scope changes due to completion of engineering/environmental studies. If the project has been programmed in the RTIP, identify the amount programmed and the RTIP project ID number.
3. Identify any additional projects that are not in the lists but which you would like to be considered for the 2007 RTP. You must provide a sufficiently detailed project description that includes project limits and location, cost, and schedule for completion. This information is necessary to allow us to properly conduct the RTP's regional emissions analysis and conformity determination.



DRAFT

The listing of projects is critical, as those projects that are not included as part of an adopted and conforming RTP will not receive environmental clearance by the federal agencies.

My staff will be contacting you shortly to schedule individual meetings to further discuss in detail this process and any questions you may have regarding the RTP and your county's submittal. The deadline for submittals to SCAG is close of business on March 1, 2006. Should you have any questions regarding this request, please feel free to contact Philip Law at 213-236-1841 or law@scag.ca.gov.

